arXiv:1410.3197v1 [math.NA] 13 Oct 2014

ON PARALLEL MULTISPLITTING METHODS FOR NON-HERMITIAN POSITIVE DEFINITE LINEAR SYSTEMS

CHENG-YI ZHANG*, SHUANGHUA LUO†, AND YAN ZHU‡

Abstract. To solve non-Hermitian linear system $Ax = b$ on parallel and vector machines, some paralell multisplitting methods are considered. In this work, in particular: i) We establish the convergence results of the paralell multisplitting methods, together with its relaxed version, some of which can be regarded as generalizations of analogous results for the Hermitian positive definite case; ii) We extend the positive-definite and skew-Hermitian splitting (PSS) method methods in [*SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 26:844–863, 2005] to the parallel PSS methods and propose the corresponding convergence results.

Key words. Paralell multisplitting method; Non-Hermitian positive definite matrices; P-regular splitting; Parallel PSS methods; convergence.

AMS subject classifications. 65F10, 15A15, 15F10.

1. Introduction.

Many problems in scientific computing give rise to a system of n linear equations in n unknowns,

$$Ax = b, \quad A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \text{ nonsingular, and } b, x \in \mathbb{C}^n, \tag{1.1}$$

where A is a large, sparse non-Hermitian matrix. In this paper we consider the important case where A is *positive definite*; i.e., the Hermitian part $H = (A + A^*)/2$ is Hermitian positive definite, where A^* denotes the conjugate transpose of the matrix A. Large, sparse systems of this type arise in many applications, including discretizations of convection-diffusion problems [11], regularized weighted least-squares problems [5], real-valued formulations of certain complex symmetric systems [4], and so forth.

In order to solve system (1.1) iteratively on parallel and vector machines, O'Leary

*Institute of Information and system Science, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, 710049, P.R. China; School of Science, Xi'an Polytechnic University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, 710048, P.R. China (chyzhang08@126.com). Supported by the Science Foundation of the Education Department of Shaanxi Province of China (11JK0492), the Scientific Research Foundation of Xi'an Polytechnic University (BS1014) and China Postdoctoral Science Foundation(20110491668).

†Department of Mathematics of School of Science, Xi'an Polytechnic University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710048, P.R. China (iwantflyluo@163.com).

‡College of Mathematic and Information Science, Qujing Normal University, Qujing, 65011, P.R. China (zhuyanlj@163.com).

and White [24] introduced the multisplitting technique for linear system. Later, this technique was further studied by many authors; see e.g. [3], [14], [15], [23], [34], [35],[37], [16], [7], [8], [22], [12], [27], [28], [29], [20], [9], [39], [40], [41] [32], [33], [10], etc.

As defined in [24] and [28] a multisplitting of A is a collection of triples of matrices $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ satisfying

- The matrix A can be split into

$$A = M_k - N_k,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots, m, \tag{1.2}$$

  where M_k is nonsingular;
- $E_k,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, are diagonal matrices with nonnegative entries and satisfy $\sum_{k=1}^m E_k = I$, the identity matrix.

ALGORITHM 1.1. *Given any initial vector* $x^{(0)}$.

- *For* $i = 0, 1, 2, \cdots,$ *until convergent.*
- *For* $k = 1$ *to* m

$$M_k y_k = N_k x^{(i)} + b \tag{1.3}$$

$$x^{(i+1)} = \sum_{k=1}^m E_k y_k. \tag{1.4}$$

It is easy to see that Algorithm 1.1 corresponds to the following iteration

$$x^{(i+1)} = \sum_{k=1}^m E_k P_k x^{(i)}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{1.5}$$

where the operators $P_k :\ \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n,\ 1 \le k \le m$, are defined as

$$P_k x = M_k^{-1} N_k x + M_k^{-1} b. \tag{1.6}$$

Thus, iteration (1.5) can be rewritten as

$$x^{(i+1)} = T x^{(i)} + \sum_{k=1}^m E_k M_k^{-1} b, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{1.7}$$

where $T = \sum_{k=1}^m E_k M_k^{-1} N_k$ is the iteration matrix.

Conditions on the splittings (1.2) and on the weighting matrices which ensure the convergence of Algorithm 1.1 in some important cases where given by O'Leary and White [24], Nabben [22], Neumann and Plemmons [23], Frommer et al [14], [15], Song et al [27], [28], [29], Li et el [20], Hadjidimos and Yeyios [16], Cao and Song [7], etc. They showed that Algorithm 1.1 (semi)converges when

- A is Hermitian (or symmetric) positive definite and the splittings (1.2) are $P-$regular;
- A is monotone and the splittings (1.2) are (weak) regular;
- A is an $H-$matrix and the splittings (1.2) are $H-$compatible splittings [41];
- A is Hermitian (or symmetric) positive semidefinite and the splittings (1.2) are $P-$regular;
- A is a singular $M-$matrix and the splittings (1.2) are (weak) regular.

Recently, there has been considerable interest in the positive-definite and skew-Hermitian splitting (PSS) method introduced by Bai, Golub, Lu and Yin for solving non-Hermitian positive definite linear systems, see [1]. In this paper we further study this method and generalize it to the parallel PSS method. Let

$$\begin{aligned} A = M_k + N_k &= (M_k + N_k^*) + (N_k - N_k^*) \\ &= P_k + S_k, \\ &\qquad k = 1, 2, \cdots, m \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

where $M_k \neq 0$ and $N_k \neq 0$. If A is non-Hermitian positive definite, so is $P_k := M_k + N_k^*$. Furthermore, $S_k := N_k - N_k^*$ is skew-Hermitian. Thus, $A = P_k + S_k,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, are PS splittings.

ALGORITHM 1.2. (*Parallel PSS method*) *Given any initial vector* $x^{(0)}$.

- *For* $i = 0, 1, 2, \cdots,$ *until convergent.*
- *For* $k = 1$ *to* m

$$\begin{cases} (\alpha_k I + P_k)x^{(i+1/2)} = (\alpha_k I - S_k)x^{(i)} + b \\ (\alpha_k I + S_k)y_k = (\alpha_k I - P_k)x^{(i+1/2)} + b \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

$$x^{(i+1)} = \sum_{k=1}^{m} E_k y_k. \tag{1.10}$$

In matrix-vector form and for each $k,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, the PSS iteration (1.9) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$y_k = M(\alpha_k)x^{(i)} + G(\alpha_k)b, \tag{1.11}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} M(\alpha_k) = (\alpha_k I + S_k)^{-1}(\alpha_k I - P_k)(\alpha_k I + P_k)^{-1}(\alpha_k I - S_k) \\ G(\alpha_k) = 2\alpha_k(\alpha_k I + S_k)^{-1}(\alpha_k I + P_k)^{-1} \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

Thus, Algorithm 1.2 can be rewritten as the following iteration scheme

$$x^{(i+1)} = \mathscr{M}(\alpha)x^{(i)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m} E_k G(\alpha_k)b, \qquad i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{1.13}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathscr{M}(\alpha) & = & \sum_{k=1}^{m} E_k M(\alpha_k) \\ & = & \sum_{k=1}^{m} E_k(\alpha_k I + S_k)^{-1}(\alpha_k I - P_k)(\alpha_k I + P_k)^{-1}(\alpha_k I - S_k) \end{array} \tag{1.14}$$

is the iteration matrix.

When the matrix N_k in (1.8) is triangular or block triangular, the splittings (1.8) are TS splittings or BTS splittings, and thus, Algorithm 1.2 becomes Parallel TSS method or Parallel BTSS method.

In Algorithms 1.1 and 1.2 a relaxation parameter $\omega \in \mathbb{R},\ \omega \neq 0$, can be introduced by replacing the computation of $x^{(i+1)}$ in (1.4) with the equation

$$\begin{array}{rcll} x^{(i+1)} & = & \omega \sum_{k=1}^{m} E_k y_k + (1-\omega)x^{(i)} & \\ & = & T_\omega x^{(i)} + \omega \sum_{k=1}^{m} E_k M_k^{-1} b, & i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \end{array} \tag{1.15}$$

where $T_\omega = \omega X + (1-\omega)I$ is the iteration matrix with either $X = T$ or $X = \mathscr{M}(\alpha)$. Clearly, with $\omega = 1$, equation (1.4) is recovered. In the case of $\omega \neq 1$, we have a Relaxed Multisplitting (see [14] and [24]) or a Relaxed Parallel PSS (TS, BTSS) Algorithm.

There have been several studies on the convergence of multisplitting iterative methods for non-Hermitian positive definite linear systems. In [16] and [31] some convergence conditions of multisplitting methods for non-Hermitian positive definite matrices have been established.

Continuing in this direction, in this paper we establish new results on multisplitting methods for solving system (1.1) iteratively, focusing on a particular class of splittings. For a given matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, a splitting $A = M - N$ with M nonsingular is called a *P-regular splitting* if the matrix $M^* + N$ is positive definite, i.e., the Hermitian part of $M^* + N$ is Hermitian positive definite [26]. It is a well known result [36, 26] that if A is Hermitian positive definite and $A = M - N$ is a P-regular splitting, then the splitting iterative method is convergent: $\rho(M^{-1}N) < 1$. An extension of *P-regular splitting* was introduced by Ortega and Plemmons [25] and [6]. A splitting $A = M - N$ with M nonsingular is called an *extended P-regular splitting* if the matrix $M^*(A^{-1})^*A + N$ is positive definite. A stronger condition of the splitting $A = M - N$ proposed by Yuan [38] that $M^*A + A^*N$ is positive definite guarantees that the splitting iterative method is convergent. In this paper, we propose some conditions such that the parallel multisplitting methods converge by examining the spectral properties of the iteration matrix induced by these special multisplittings of a non-Hermitian positive definite matrix.

The paper is organized as follows. Some notations and preliminary results are given in Section 2. In section 3 we study the convergence of Algorithm 1.1, together with its relaxed version. In section 4 we discuss the convergence of Algorithm 1.2. Some conclusions are given in section 5.

2. Notation and preliminaries. For convenience, some of the terminology used in this paper will be given.

The symbol $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ will denote the set of all $n \times n$ complex matrices. Let $A,\ B \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. We use the notation $A \succ 0$ ($A \succeq 0$) if A is Hermitian positive (semi-)definite. If A and B are both Hermitian, we write $A \succ B$ ($A \succeq B$) if and only if $A - B \succ 0$ ($A - B \succeq 0$). If A is Hermitian matrix, then all of eigenvalues of A are real, and we denote by $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ the smallest (i.e., leftmost) and largest (rightmost) eigenvalues, respectively. Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ with $H = (A + A^*)/2$ and $S = (A - A^*)/2$ its Hermitian and skew-Hermitian parts, respectively; then A is non-Hermitian positive (semi-)definite if and only if $H \succ 0$ ($H \succeq 0$). Furthermore, $\|A\|_2 = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(A^*A)}$, denotes the spectral norm of the matrix A.

The following theorems gives convergence conditions for iterative methods based on a single splitting $A = M - N$.

THEOREM 2.1. (see [42]) *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be non-Hermitian positive definite, and let $A = M - N$ be a P-regular splitting with N Hermitian. Then $\rho(M^{-1}N) < 1$.*

The proof can be found, e.g, in [42].

COROLLARY 2.2. (see [42]) *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be non-Hermitian positive definite, and let $A = M - N$ be a splitting with $N \succeq 0$. Then $\rho(M^{-1}N) < 1$.*

THEOREM 2.3. (see [25] and [6]) *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ such that $A = M - N$ is an extended P-regular splitting. Then $\rho(T) < 1$, where $T = M^{-1}N$, if and only if A is positive definite.*

REMARK 2.4. *The condition that $A = M-N$ is an extended P-regular splitting can be replaced by the condition that $M + N^*(A^{-1})^*A$ is positive definite since $A = M - N$ is an extended P-regular splitting,*

$$\begin{aligned} M^*(A^{-1})^*A + N &= (A + N)^*(A^{-1})^*A + N \\ &= M + N^*(A^{-1})^*A \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

is positive definite.

THEOREM 2.5. (see [38]) *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be nonsingular, and let $A = M - N$ such that $M^*A + A^*N = M^*M - N^*N$ is positive definite. Then Then $\rho(T) < 1$, where $T = M^{-1}N$.*

A convergence result on multisplitting method for nonsymmetric positive definite linear system is introduced by Hadjidimos and Yeyios [16].

THEOREM 2.6. (see [16]) *Let $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be nonsymmetric positive definite*

with a multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ *satisfying*

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
M_k & = & D+\rho_k I-L, \quad N_k=\rho_k I+U, \quad 1\le k\le m; \\
M_k & = & D+\rho_k I-U, \quad N_k=\rho_k I+L, \quad m+1\le k\le 2m; \\
\rho_k & > & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} max\{0,-\eta_m/\lambda_m\} for 1\le k\le m \\ max\{0,-\theta_m/\lambda_m\} for m+1\le k\le 2m \end{array} \right. , \quad E_k=\alpha_k I,
\end{array} \tag{2.2}
$$

where $D = diag(A)$, L, U *are strictly lower and upper triangular matrices satisfying* $A = D - L - U$; λ_m *is the minimal eigenvalue of* $A + A^T$ *and* η_m, θ_m *are the minimal eigenvalues of the matrices* $(D-L)(D-L)^T - UU^T$ *and* $(D-U)(D-U)^T - LL^T$, *respectively. Then Algorithm 1.1 converges.*

3. Convergence of stationary multisplitting method. In this section we discuss convergence of the parallel mulitisplitting iterative methods for non-Hermitian linear systems, especially, non-Hermitian positive definite linear systems.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let* $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ *be nonsingular with a multisplitting* $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ *satisfying one of the following conditions:*

(i) $E_k = \beta_k I$ *and* $M_k^* A + A^* N_k = M_k^* M_k - N_k^* N_k \succ 0$ *for* $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$;

(ii) $E_k = \beta_k I$ *and* $\|M_k^{-1} N_k\|_2 < 1$ *for* $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$.

Then Algorithm 1.1 converges to the unique solution of (1.1) *for any choice of the initial guess* $x^{(0)}$.

Proof. The iteration matrix of Algorithm 1.1 is $T = \sum_{k=1}^m E_k M_k^{-1} N_k$. Algorithm 1.1 is convergent by showing $\rho(T) < 1$.

1) Assume that the condition (i) holds. Then, similar to the proof of Theorem 1 in [24], one has

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
A^*A & - & T^*A^*AT \\
& = & A^*A - (\sum_{k=1}^m E_k M_k^{-1} N_k)^* A^* A (\sum_{k=1}^m E_k M_k^{-1} N_k) \\
& = & A^*A - (I - \sum_{k=1}^m E_k M_k^{-1} A)^* A^* A (I - \sum_{k=1}^m E_k M_k^{-1} A) \\
& = & \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k (A^* A M_k^{-1} A + A^* (M_k^{-1})^* A^* A) \\
& & - \sum_{k,j=1}^m \beta_k \beta_j A^* (M_k^{-1})^* A^* A M_j^{-1} A \\
& = & \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k A^* (M_k^{-1})^* (M_k^* A + A^* M_k - \beta_k A^* A) M_k^{-1} A \\
& & - \sum_{k,j=1;k\neq j}^m \beta_k \beta_j A^* (M_k^{-1})^* A^* A M_j^{-1} A \\
& = & \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k A^* (M_k^{-1})^* (M_k^* A + A^* N_k + \sum_{j=1;j\neq k}^m \beta_j A^* A) M_k^{-1} A \\
& & - \sum_{k,j=1;k\neq j}^m \beta_k \beta_j A^* (M_k^{-1})^* A^* A M_j^{-1} A \\
& = & \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k A^* (M_k^{-1})^* (M_k^* A + A^* N_k) M_k^{-1} A \\
& & + \sum_{k,j=1;k\neq j}^m \beta_k \beta_j A^* (M_k^{-1})^* A^* A (M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1}) A \\
& = & S_1 + S_2,
\end{array} \tag{3.1}
$$

where

$$\begin{array}{rcl} S_1 &=& \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_k A^*(M_k^{-1})^*(M_k^*A + A^*N_k)M_k^{-1}A \quad \text{and} \\ S_2 &=& \sum_{k,j=1;k\neq j}^{m} \beta_k\beta_j A^*(M_k^{-1})^*A^*A(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})A. \end{array} \tag{3.2}$$

Since A and M_k are nonsingular, $M_k^*A + A^*N_k = M_k^*M_k - N_k^*N_k \succ 0$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, it is easy to see

$$S_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_k A^*(M_k^{-1})^*(M_k^*A + A^*N_k)M_k^{-1}A \succ 0. \tag{3.3}$$

It is observed that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 2S &=& S_2^* + S_2 \\ &=& \sum_{k,j=1;k\neq j}^{m} \beta_k\beta_j[A^*(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})^*A^*AM_k^{-1}A \\ && +A^*(M_k^{-1})^*A^*A(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})A] \\ &=& \sum_{k,j=1;k\neq j}^{m} \beta_k\beta_j[A^*(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})^*A^*A(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})A \\ && +A^*(M_k^{-1})^*A^*A(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})A + A^*(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})^*A^*AM_j^{-1}A] \\ &=& \sum_{k,j=1;k\neq j}^{m} \beta_k\beta_j A^*(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})^*A^*A(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})A \\ && +\sum_{k,j=1;k\neq j}^{m} \beta_k\beta_j[A^*(M_k^{-1})^*A^*AM_k^{-1}A - A^*(M_j^{-1})^*A^*AM_j^{-1}A] \\ &=& \sum_{k,j=1;k\neq j}^{m} \beta_k\beta_j A^*(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})^*A^*A(M_k^{-1} - M_j^{-1})A \\ &\succeq& 0. \end{array} \tag{3.4}$$

As a result, (3.1), (3.3) and (3.4) indicate $A^*A - T^*A^*AT \succ 0$. Since A is nonsingular, $A^*A \succ 0$. It follows from Stein's Theorem (see, e.g., [26, 30]) that T is convergent, i.e., $\rho(T) < 1$. Thus, Algorithm 1.1 is convergent.

2) Now, assume that the condition (ii) holds, that is, $E_k = \beta_k I$ and $\|M_k^{-1}N_k\|_2 < 1$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \rho(T) &\leq& \|T\|_2 = \|\sum_{k=1}^{m} E_k M_k^{-1}N_k\|_2 \\ &\leq& \sum_{k,=1}^{m} \|E_k M_k^{-1}N_k\|_2 \\ &=& \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_k \|M_k^{-1}N_k\|_2 \\ &<& \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_k = 1, \end{array} \tag{3.5}$$

which shows that Algorithm 1.1 is convergent. This completes the proof. □

REMARK 3.2. *If the multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ is defined by (2.2), we have $\|M_k^{-1}N_k\|_2 < 1$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ (see the proof of Theorem 2.4 in [16]) and can obtain the proof of Theorem 2.6 coming from Theorem 3.1. Therefore, similar to (2.2), we can construct a multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ to satisfy the condition (ii) of Theorem 3.1.*

In what follows some convergence results on parallel mulitisplitting method for non-Hermitian positive definite linear systems will be established. At first, the following

lemma will be used in this section.

LEMMA 3.3. (see [6]) *Let $A = M - N \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ with A and M nonsingular and let $T = M^{-1}N$. Then $A - T^*AT = (I - T^*)(M^*(A^{-1})^*A + N)(I - T)$.*

THEOREM 3.4. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be non-Hermitian positive definite with a multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ satisfying the condition that $E_k = \beta_k I$ and $A = M_k - N_k$ is an extended P-regular splitting for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Then Algorithm 1.1 converges to the unique solution of* (1.1) *for any choice of the initial guess $x^{(0)}$.*

Proof. Since the multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ satisfies the condition that $E_k = \beta_k I$ and $A = M_k - N_k$ is an extended $P-$regular splitting for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, $M_k^*(A^{-1})^*A + N_k$ is positive definite. Let $T_k = M_k^{-1}N_k$ for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, then the iteration matrix of Algorithm 1.1 is

$$T = \sum_{k=1}^{m} E_k T_k = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_k T_k. \tag{3.6}$$

It follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$A - T_k^* A T_k = (I - T_k^*)(M_k^*(A^{-1})^*A + N_k)(I - T_k). \tag{3.7}$$

Again, Theorem 2.3 shows that $\rho(T_k) < 1$, and consequently $I - T_k$ is nonsingular. Since $M_k^*(A^{-1})^*A + N_k$ is positive definite, (3.7) shows that $A - T_k^*AT_k$ is also positive definite for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Noting that A is positive definite, its Hermitian part $H = (A + A^*)/2 \succ 0$. Then, (3.7) shows

$$H - T_k^* H T_k \succ 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \cdots, m, \tag{3.8}$$

which indicates

$$I \succ (H^{1/2}T_k H^{-1/2})^*(H^{-1/2}T_k H^{1/2}) \quad k = 1, 2, \cdots, m. \tag{3.9}$$

As a result,

$$\|H^{1/2}T_k H^{-1/2}\|_2 < 1 \quad k = 1, 2, \cdots, m. \tag{3.10}$$

Therefore, we have with (3.6) and (3.10) that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \rho(T) & = & \rho(H^{1/2}TH^{-1/2}) \le \|H^{1/2}TH^{-1/2}\|_2 \\ & = & \|\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k H^{1/2}T_k H^{-1/2}\|_2 \\ & \le & \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k \|H^{1/2}T_k H^{-1/2}\|_2 \\ & < & \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k = 1, \end{array} \tag{3.11}$$

which shows Algorithm 1.1 is convergent. This completes the proof. □

In Theorems 3.1 and 3.4, some conditions such that Algorithm 1.1 converges have been presented. But, it is difficult for us to construct a multisplitting such that these conditions are easy to determine since they concern very complex matrix operations. In the following, we will propose a practical condition which is are easy to determine such that Algorithm 1.1 converges.

For the convenience of the proof of the following theorems, we will introduce a type of block matrices——*extended $H-$matrices* which is further extension of *generalized $M-$matrices* and *generalized $H-$matrices* introduced by Elsner and Mehrmann [13] and Nabben [21], respectively.

DEFINITION 3.5. (see [13])

1. $Z_m^k = \{A = [A_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{km\times km} \mid A_{ij} \in C^{k\times k}$ *is Hermitian for all* $i, j \in N = \{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ *and* $A_{ij} \preceq 0$ *for all* $i \neq j,\ i, j \in N\}$;
2. $\widehat{Z}_m^k = \{A = [A_{ij}] \in Z_m^k \mid A_{ii} \succ 0,\ i \in N\}$;
3. $M_m^k = \{A \in \widehat{Z}_m^k \mid$ *there exists* $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ *such that* $\sum_{j=1}^m u_j A_{ij} \succ 0$ *for all* $i \in N\}$, *where* $\mathbb{R}_+^m$ *denotes all positive vectors in* $\mathbb{R}^m$, *and a matrix* $A \in \widehat{Z}_m^k$ *is called a generalized $M-$matrix if* $A \in M_m^k$.

DEFINITION 3.6. *We define a set of* $n\times n$ *matrices* $\Omega^n = \{\ A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \mid$ *there exsits a nonsingular matrix* $C \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ *such that* $A = C^*DC$, *where* $D = diag(d_1, \cdots, d_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}\}$. *Let* $A \in \Omega^n$. Then there must exsit a nonsingular matrix $C \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ such that $A = C^*DC$, where $D = diag(d_1, \cdots, d_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. *Define*

$$\langle A\rangle := C^*|D|C, \tag{3.12}$$

where $|D| = diag(|d_1|, \cdots, |d_n|) \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$.

REMARK 3.7. *The set Ω^n includes many families of matrices such as unitary matrices, Hermitian matrices, skew-Hermitian matrices, normal matrices and positive definite matrices (not necessarily Hermitian, see Theorem 3 in [19]).*

DEFINITION 3.8.

1. $\Phi_m^k = \{A = [A_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{km\times km} \mid A_{ij} \in \Omega^k$ *for all* $i, j \in N = \{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ *and* A_{ii} *is positve definite for all* $i \in N\}$;
2. $H_m^k = \{A \in \Phi_m^k \mid \mu(A) \in M_m^k\}$, *where* $\mu(A) = [M_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{mk\times mk}$ *is the block comparison matrix of A and defined as*

$$M_{ij} := \begin{cases} (A_{ii} + A_{ii}^*)/2, & \text{if } \ i = j \\ \langle A_{ij}\rangle, & \text{if } \ i \neq j \end{cases},$$

and a matrix $A \in \Phi_m^k$ *is called an extended $H-$matrix if* $A \in H_m^k$.

LEMMA 3.9. *Let* $B = C^*DC \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ *with* $C \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ *nonsingular and* $D = \mathrm{diag}(d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, *and let* $\langle B\rangle = C^*|D|C \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ *with* $|D| = \mathrm{diag}(|d_1|, \ldots, |d_n|)$.

Then the Hermitian matrix $\mathscr{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \langle B\rangle & e^{it}B \\ e^{-it}B^* & \langle B\rangle \end{bmatrix}$ *is positive semidefinite for all* $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Observe that $\mathscr{B}$ can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{B} &= \begin{bmatrix} \langle B\rangle & e^{it}B \\ e^{-it}B^* & \langle B\rangle \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C^* & 0 \\ 0 & C^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} |D| & e^{it}D \\ e^{-it}D^* & |D| \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathscr{C}^* \begin{bmatrix} |D| & e^{it}D \\ e^{-it}D^* & |D| \end{bmatrix} \mathscr{C}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where $\mathscr{C} = \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{bmatrix}$ is nonsingular since C is. Writing $\mathscr{D} = \begin{bmatrix} |D| & e^{it}D \\ e^{-it}D^* & |D| \end{bmatrix}$, (3.13) shows that the Hermitian matrices $\mathscr{B}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ are congruent, and therefore they must have the same inertia. Hence, all we need to show is that $\mathscr{D}$ is positive semidefinite. Letting $\mathscr{P}$ denote the odd-even permutation matrix of order $2n$, it is immediate to see that

$$\mathscr{P}^*\mathscr{D}\mathscr{P} = \begin{bmatrix} |d_1| & e^{it}d_1 \\ e^{-it}\bar{d}_1 & |d_1| \end{bmatrix} \oplus \cdots \oplus \begin{bmatrix} |d_n| & e^{it}d_n \\ e^{-it}\bar{d}_n & |d_n| \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, $\mathscr{P}^*\mathscr{D}\mathscr{P}$ is just a direct sum of n two-by-two Hermitian matrices, each of which is obviously positive semidefinite. This shows that $\mathscr{D} \succeq 0$, and the proof is complete. □

LEMMA 3.10. *Let* $A = [A_{ij}] \in \Phi_m^k$. *For* $t \in R$, *define*

$$A_t = B + B^* - (e^{it}C + e^{-it}C^*), \tag{3.14}$$

where $B = diag(B_{11}, \cdots, B_{mm})$ *and* $C = B - A = [C_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{km\times km}$ *with* $C_{ii} = C_{ii}^*$ *for all* $i = 1, \cdots, m$. *Let* $\tilde{C} = [\tilde{C}_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{km\times km}$ *with* $\tilde{C}_{ij} = \langle C_{ij}\rangle$ *for all* $i, j = 1, \cdots, m$, *and let* $\tilde{A} = B - \tilde{C}$. *If* $\mu(\tilde{A}) + \mu(\tilde{A}^*) \in M_m^k$, *then* $A_t \succ 0$ *for all* $t \in R$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{A} = [\tilde{A}_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{km\times km}$. Then

$$\tilde{A}_{ii} = B_{ii} - \tilde{C}_{ii} = B_{ii} - \langle C_{ii}\rangle \ \text{ and } \ \tilde{A}_{ij} = \tilde{C}_{ij} = \langle C_{ij}\rangle = \langle A_{ij}\rangle, \quad i \neq j, \tag{3.15}$$

for $i, j = 1, \cdots, m$. Since $\mu(\tilde{A}) + \mu(\tilde{A}^*) \in M_m^k$, there exists a vector $v = (v_1, \cdots, v_m)^T \in R_+^m$ such that

$$v_i(\tilde{A}_{ii} + \tilde{A}_{ii}^*) - \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{m} v_j(\langle \tilde{A}_{ij}\rangle + \langle A_{ji}^*\rangle) \succ 0 \tag{3.16}$$

for all $i \in N = \{1, \cdots, m\}$. Multiply the inequality (3.16) by v_i and define $V = diag(v_1 I_k, \cdots, v_m I_k)$, where I_k is $k \times k$ identity matrix, such that $K = V\tilde{A}V$ satisfies

$$v_i^2(\tilde{A}_{ii} + \tilde{A}_{ii}^*) - \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{m} [\langle v_i\tilde{A}_{ij}v_j\rangle + \langle (v_j\tilde{A}_{ji}v_i)^*\rangle] \succ 0 \tag{3.17}$$

for all $i \in N$. Let $K = V\tilde{A}V = [K_{ij}]$ with $K_{ij} = v_i\tilde{A}_{ij}v_j$ for all $i, j \in N$. Then following (3.17), we have

$$R_i(K) = (K_{ii} + K_{ii}^*) - \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{m} [\langle K_{ij}\rangle + \langle K_{ji}\rangle] \succ 0, \quad i = 1, \cdots, m. \tag{3.18}$$

Furthermore, according to (3.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_t &= VA_tV = V[B + B^* - (e^{it}C + e^{-it}C^*)]V \\ &= V[B + B^* - (e^{it} + e^{-it})D_C - (e^{it}\hat{C} + e^{-it}\hat{C}^*)]V, \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where $D_C = diag(C_{11}, \cdots, C_{mm})$ and $\hat{C} = C - D_C$. Since $C = A - B$ and $C_{ii} = C_{ii}^*$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, m$, $C_{ii} = B_{ii} - A_{ii}$ and hence, coming from (3.15), we have

$$B_{ii} + B_{ii}^* - (e^{it} + e^{-it})C_{ii} \succeq B_{ii} + B_{ii}^* - 2\langle C_{ii}\rangle = \tilde{A}_{ii} + \tilde{A}_{ii}^* \succ 0 \tag{3.20}$$

for all $i = 1, \cdots, m$. Thus,

$$B + B^* - (e^{it} + e^{-it})D_C \succeq D_{\tilde{A}} + D_{\tilde{A}}^* \succ 0, \tag{3.21}$$

where $D_{\tilde{A}} = diag(\tilde{A}_{11}, \cdots, \tilde{A}_{mm})$. (3.15), (3.19) and (3.21) imply

$$\begin{aligned} K_t &\succeq V[D_A + D_A^* - (e^{it}\hat{C} + e^{-it}\hat{C}^*)]V \\ &= \Delta + \sum_{i>j} R_{ij} + \sum_{i<j} S_{ij}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

where

$$\Delta = diag\{R_1(K), \cdots, R_m(K)\},$$

$$R_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \langle K_{ij}\rangle & 0 & \cdots & e^{-it}K_{ij}^* & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & e^{it}K_{ij} & 0 & \cdots & \langle K_{ij}\rangle & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.23}$$

and

$$S_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \langle K_{ij} \rangle & 0 & \cdots & e^{it}K_{ij} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & e^{-it}K_{ij}^* & 0 & \cdots & \langle K_{ij} \rangle & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3.24}$$

Since (3.18) yields $\Delta \succ 0$ and Lemma 3.9 indicates $R_{ij} \succeq 0$ and $S_{ij} \succeq 0$, $K_t \succ 0$ and hence $A_t \succ 0$ for all $t \in R$. This completes the proof. □

LEMMA 3.11. (see [21]) *Let $A,\ M,\ N \in C^{n\times n}$ with $A = M - N$. If for all $t \in R$*

$$A_t := M + M^H - (e^{it}N + e^{-it}N^H) > 0, \tag{3.25}$$

then $\rho(M^{-1}N) < 1$. If $A_t \geq 0$ for all $t \in R$, then $\rho(M^{-1}N) \leq 1$.

LEMMA 3.12. *Let $A = [A_{ij}] \in M_m^k$. Then there exist two positive diagonal matrices $E = diag(E_1, \cdots, E_m)$ and $F = diag(F_1, \cdots, F_m)$, where $E_i = e_iI \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$ and $F_i = f_iI \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$ with $e_i > 0$ and $f_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, m$, such that $EAF + FA^*E \in M_m^k$.*

Proof. The proof can be immediately obtained from Lemma 3.1 in [18]. □

THEOREM 3.13. *Let $A = [A_{ij}] \in \Phi_m^k$, $B = diag(B_{11}, \cdots, B_{mm})$ and $C = B - A = [C_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{km\times km}$ with $C_{ii} = C_{ii}^*$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, m$. Assume $\tilde{C} = [\tilde{C}_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{km\times km}$ with $\tilde{C}_{ij} = \langle C_{ij} \rangle$ for all $i, j = 1, \cdots, m$, and let $\tilde{A} = B - \tilde{C}$. If $\tilde{A} \in H_m^k$, then $\rho(B^{-1}C) < 1$.*

Proof. Since $\tilde{A} \in H_m^k$, $\mu(\tilde{A}) \in M_m^k$. Lemma 3.12 shows that there exist two positive diagonal matrices $E = diag(E_1, \cdots, E_m)$ and $F = diag(F_1, \cdots, F_m)$, where $E_i = e_iI \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$ and $F_i = f_iI \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$ with $e_i > 0$ and $f_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, m$, such that $E\mu(\tilde{A})F + F\mu(\tilde{A})^*E = \mu(E\tilde{A}F) + \mu(F\tilde{A}^*E) \in M_m^k$. $A = B - C$ yields $EAF = EBF - ECF$. Let $\hat{A} = EAF$, $\hat{B} = EBF$ and $\hat{C} = ECF$. Since $\hat{B} = EBF = diag(\hat{B}_{11}, \cdots, \hat{B}_{mm})$ with $\hat{B}_{ii} = e_iB_{ii}f_i$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, m$ and $\hat{C} = \hat{B} - \hat{A}$, it follows from Lemma 3.10 that

$$\hat{A}_t = \hat{B} + \hat{B}^* - (e^{it}\hat{C} + e^{-it}\hat{C}^*) \succ 0 \tag{3.26}$$

for all $t \in R$. Lemma 3.11 shows that $\rho(\hat{B}^{-1}\hat{C}) < 1$. Again,

$$\hat{B}^{-1}\hat{C} = (EBF)^{-1}(ECF) = F^{-1}(B^{-1}C)F.$$

Then $\hat{B}^{-1}\hat{C}$ and $B^{-1}C$ have the same eigenvalues. As a result,

$$\rho(B^{-1}C) = \rho(\hat{B}^{-1}\hat{C}) < 1$$

which shows that we complete the proof. □

LEMMA 3.14. *Let $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ with a multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$, and let $T = \sum_{k=1}^m E_k M_k^{-1} N_k$ and $\hat{A} = B - C$, where*

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & M_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & M_m \end{bmatrix}, \; C = \begin{bmatrix} N_1E_1 & N_1E_2 & \cdots & N_1E_m \\ N_2E_1 & N_2E_2 & \cdots & N_2E_m \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ N_mE_1 & N_mE_2 & \cdots & N_mE_m \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3.27}$$

Then $\rho(T) = \rho(B^{-1}C)$, where $\rho(T)$ denotes the spectral radius of the matrix T.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(T) &= \rho(\sum_{k=1}^m E_k M_k^{-1} N_k) \\ &= \rho\left(\begin{bmatrix} E_1 & E_2 & \cdots & E_m \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_1^{-1}N_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ M_2^{-1}N_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_m^{-1}N_m & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) \\ &= \rho\left(\begin{bmatrix} M_1^{-1}N_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ M_2^{-1}N_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_m^{-1}N_m & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} E_1 & E_2 & \cdots & E_m \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) \\ &= \rho\left(\begin{bmatrix} M_1^{-1}N_1E_1 & M_1^{-1}N_1E_2 & \cdots & M_1^{-1}N_1E_m \\ M_2^{-1}N_2E_1 & M_2^{-1}N_2E_2 & \cdots & M_2^{-1}N_2E_m \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_m^{-1}N_mE_1 & M_m^{-1}N_mE_2 & \cdots & M_m^{-1}N_mE_m \end{bmatrix}\right) \\ &= \rho(B^{-1}C), \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

where B and C are defined as (3.27). This completes the proof. □

LEMMA 3.15. (see Corollary 7.6.5 in [17]) *Let $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be Hermitian and $A \succ 0$. Then there exists a nonsingular matrix $C \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ such that $A = C^*C$ and $B = C^*DC$, where $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is a diagonal matrix.*

THEOREM 3.16. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be non-Hermitian positive definite with a multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ satisfying the condition that $E_k = \beta_k I$ and $A = M_k - N_k$*

is a P-regular splitting with N_k Hermitian for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Then Algorithm 1.1 converges to the unique solution of (1.1) *for any choice of the initial guess $x^{(0)}$.*

Proof. We only prove $\rho(T) < 1$. Lemma 3.1 shows $\rho(T) = \rho(B^{-1}C)$, where B and C are defined as (3.27), and $\hat{A} = B - C$. Since $E_k = \beta_k I$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A} &= B - C \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & M_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & M_m \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1 N_1 & \beta_2 N_1 & \cdots & \beta_m N_1 \\ \beta_1 N_2 & \beta_2 N_2 & \cdots & \beta_m N_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_1 N_m & \beta_2 N_m & \cdots & \beta_m N_m \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

Let $H(M_k) = (M_k + M_k^*)/2$ be the Hermitian part of M_k for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Since A is non-Hermitian positive definite and $A = M_k - N_k$ is P-regular splittings with N_k Hermitian for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, one has

$$H(M_k) + N_k \succ 0, \quad H(M_k) - N_k \succ 0. \tag{3.30}$$

(3.30) shows that $H(M_k) \succ 0$. Also, N_k is Hermitian. It follows from Lemma 3.15 that there exists a nonsingular matrix $C_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ such that $H(M_k) = C_k^* C_k$ and $N_k = C_k^* D_k C_k$, where $D_k \in \mathbb{R}$ are diagonal matrices. Following (3.30), we have

$$C_k^*(I + D_k)C_k \succ 0, \quad C_k^*(I - D_k)C_k \succ 0 \tag{3.31}$$

and consequently,

$$I + D_k \succ 0, \quad I - D_k \succ 0, \tag{3.32}$$

which shows that

$$I - |D_k| \succ 0. \tag{3.33}$$

As a consequence,

$$H(M_k) - \langle N_k \rangle = C_k^*(I - |D_k|)C_k \succ 0. \tag{3.34}$$

This leads to

$$H(M_k) - \langle N_k \rangle = (H(M_k) - \beta_k \langle N_k \rangle) - \textstyle\sum_{j=1, j\neq k}^{m} (\beta_j \langle N_k \rangle) \succ 0 \tag{3.35}$$

for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Let $\tilde{C} = [\tilde{C}_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{km\times km}$ with $\tilde{C}_{ij} = \langle \beta_j N_i \rangle$ for all $i, j = 1, \cdots, m$, and let $\tilde{A} = B - \tilde{C}$. (3.35) shows $\tilde{A} \in H_m^k$. It follows from Theorem 3.13 that $\rho(T) = \rho(B^{-1}C) < 1$. Therefore, Algorithm 1.1 is convergent. This completes the proof. □

Following Theorem 3.16, a corollary is obtained immediately.

COROLLARY 3.17. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be non-Hermitian positive definite with a multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ satisfying the condition that $E_k = \beta_k I$ and $N_k \succeq 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Then Algorithm 1.1 converges to the unique solution of* (1.1) *for any choice of the initial guess $x^{(0)}$.*

Now, we study the convergence of the relaxed multisplitting method.

THEOREM 3.18. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be nonsingular with a multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ satisfying one of the following conditions:*

(i) *$E_k = \beta_k I$ and $M_k^* A + A^* N_k = M_k^* M_k - N_k^* N_k \succ 0$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$;*

(ii) *$E_k = \beta_k I$ and $\|M_k^{-1} N_k\|_2 < 1$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$.*

Then the relaxed multisplitting algorithm converges to the unique solution of (1.1) *for any choice of the initial guess $x^{(0)}$, provided $\omega \in (0, 2/(1+\rho))$, where $\rho = \rho(T)$ and T is defined in (1.7).*

Proof. Since the iteration matrix of the relaxed multisplitting algorithm is $T_\omega = \omega T + (1-\omega)I$, where T is the iteration matrix of Algorithm 1.1. Let $\lambda_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, n$, be eigenvalues of T, then $\omega\lambda_i + (1-\omega),\ i = 1, \cdots, n$, are eigenvalues of T_ω. Assume $\rho(T_\omega) = |\omega\lambda_1 + (1-\omega)|$. Then $\rho(T_\omega) \le \omega|\lambda_1| + |1-\omega| \le \omega\rho(T) + |1-\omega|$. Since Theorem 3.1 gives $\rho(T) < 1$ and $\omega \in (0, 2/(1+\rho(T)))$, $\rho(T_\omega) < 1$, which shows that the relaxed multisplitting algorithm converges for any initial vector $x^{(0)}$, provided $\omega \in (0, 2/(1+\rho))$. □

THEOREM 3.19. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be non-Hermitian positive definite with a multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ satisfying one of the following conditions:*

(i) *$E_k = \beta_k I$ and $A = M_k - N_k$ is an extended P-regular splitting for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$;*

(ii) *$E_k = \beta_k I$ and $A = M_k - N_k$ is a P-regular splitting with N_k Hermitian for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$;*

(iii) *$E_k = \beta_k I$ and $N_k \succeq 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$.*

Then the relaxed multisplitting algorithm converges to the unique solution of (1.1) *for any choice of the initial guess $x^{(0)}$, provided $\omega \in (0, 2/(1+\rho))$, where $\rho = \rho(T)$ and T is defined in (1.7).*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.18, the proof can be obtained immediately from Theorem 3.3, Theorem 3.16 and Corollary 3.17. □

4. Convergence of parallel PSS method. In this section some convergence results on the parallel PSS methods for non-Hermitian positive definite linear systems

will be presented. The following lemma will be used in this section.

LEMMA 4.1. (see [1]) *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be non-Hermitian positive definite, let $M(\alpha_k)$ defined in (1.12) be the iteration matrix of the PSS iteration, and let*

$$V(\alpha_k) = (\alpha_k I - P_k)(\alpha_k I + P_k)^{-1}. \tag{4.1}$$

Then the spectral radius $\rho(M(\alpha_k))$ of $M(\alpha_k)$ is bound by $\|V(\alpha_k)\|_2$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\rho(M(\alpha_k)) \le \|M(\alpha_k)\|_2 \le \|V(\alpha_k)\|_2 < 1, \quad \forall \alpha_k > 0. \tag{4.2}$$

THEOREM 4.2. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be non-Hermitian positive definite with a multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ such that (1.8) holds and $E_k = \beta_k I$ and $\alpha_k \ge 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Then Algorithm 1.2 converges to the unique solution of* (1.1) *for any choice of the initial guess $x^{(0)}$.*

Proof. Observing that the iteration matrix of Algorithm 1.2 is defined as $\mathscr{M}(\alpha) = \sum_{k=1}^m E_k M(\alpha_k)$ and $E_k = \beta_k I$ and $\alpha_k \ge 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Then Lemma 4.1 shows that $\rho(M(\alpha_k)) \le \|M(\alpha_k)\|_2 < 1$. As a consequence,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \rho(\mathscr{M}(\alpha)) & \le & \|\mathscr{M}(\alpha)\|_2 = \|\sum_{k=1}^m E_k M(\alpha_k)\|_2 \\ & \le & \sum_{k,=1}^m \|E_k M(\alpha_k)\|_2 \\ & = & \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k \|M(\alpha_k)\|_2 \\ & < & \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k = 1, \end{array} \tag{4.3}$$

which shows that Algorithm 1.2 is convergent. This completes the proof. □

THEOREM 4.3. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be non-Hermitian positive definite with a multisplitting $(M_k, N_k, E_k)_{k=1}^m$ such that (1.8) holds, $E_k = \beta_k I$ and $\alpha_k \ge 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Then the Relaxed Parallel PSS Algorithm converges to the unique solution of* (1.1) *for any choice of the initial guess $x^{(0)}$, provided $\omega \in (0, 2/(1+\rho))$, where $\rho = \rho(\mathscr{M}(\alpha))$ and $\mathscr{M}(\alpha)$ is defined in (1.14).*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.18, the proof can be obtained immediately from Theorem 4.2. □

REMARK 4.4. *As two special cases of the Parallel PSS method, the Parallel TSS method and Parallel BTSS method together with their relaxed versions are convergent.*

As is pointed out in [1], there are two important problems to be further studied for the Parallel PSS method. One is the choice of the skew-Hermitian matrix $S_k = N_k - N_k^*$, here is the choice of the matrix N_k such that $P_k = M_k + N_k^*$ is easily inverted. Here, N_k can be chosen as triangular or block triangular matrix (see [1]) such that $P_k = M_k + N_k^*$ is triangular or block triangular matrix.

The other is the choice of the acceleration parameter α_k such that the Parallel PSS method converges very fast. If $P_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is a normal matrix, then we can compute $\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star = arg\ min_{\alpha>0}\{\|V(\alpha_k)\|_2\}$ by making use of the formula in Theorem 2.2 of [2]. But there is not such a formula as in Theorem 2.2 of [2] to compute a usable $\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star$ if $P_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is a general positive definite matrix, and hence, the upper bound $\|V(\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star)\|_2$. Now, we give such a formula to compute $\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star$ and hence, the upper bound $\|V(\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star)\|_2$.

THEOREM 4.5. *Let $P_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be non-Hermitian positive definite with $H_k = (P_k + P_k^*)/2$ its Hermitian part, and let $V_k(\alpha_k)$ be defined in (4.1). Then it holds that*

$$\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star = arg\ min_{\alpha_k>0}\{\|V(\alpha_k)\|_2\} = \sqrt{x^*P_k^*P_kx} \in [\sigma_n^k, \sigma_1^k] \tag{4.4}$$

and

$$\|V(\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star)\|_2 = min_{\alpha_k>0}\{\|V(\alpha_k)\|_2\} = \sqrt{\frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star - x^*H_kx}{\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star + x^*H_kx}}, \tag{4.5}$$

where x satisfies $\|x\|_2 = 1$ and $G^{-1}Kx = \rho(G^{-1}K)x$ with $G = (\alpha_kI + P_k)^*(\alpha_kI + P_k)$ and $K = (\alpha_kI - P_k)^*(\alpha_kI - P_k)$, and σ_n^k and σ_1^k are the minimal and maximal singular values of P_k, respectively.

Proof. Since $\|V(\alpha_k)\|_2 = \rho(V(\alpha_k)^*V(\alpha_k))$ and (4.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \|V(\alpha_k)\|_2^2 &= \rho((\alpha_kI + P_k^*)^{-1}(\alpha_kI - P_k)^*(\alpha_kI - P_k)(\alpha_kI + P_k)^{-1}) \\ &= \rho\{[(\alpha_kI + P_k)^*(\alpha_kI + P_k)]^{-1}(\alpha_kI - P_k)^*(\alpha_kI - P_k)\} \\ &= \rho(G^{-1}K). \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

$\|x\|_2 = 1$, $G^{-1}Kx = \rho(G^{-1}K)x$ and (4.6) show that it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|V(\alpha_k)\|_2^2 &= \rho(G^{-1}K) = \frac{x^*Kx}{x^*Gx} \\ &= \frac{x^*[(\alpha_kI - P_k)^*(\alpha_kI - P_k)]x}{x^*[(\alpha_kI + P_k)^*(\alpha_kI + P_k)]x} \\ &= \frac{\alpha_k^2 - 2\alpha_kx^*H_kx + x^*P_k^*P_kx}{\alpha_k^2 + 2\alpha_kx^*H_kx + x^*P_k^*P_kx} \\ &= 1 - \frac{4\alpha_kx^*H_kx}{\alpha_k^2 + 2\alpha_kx^*H_kx + x^*P_k^*P_kx} \\ &= 1 - f(\alpha_k), \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where $f(\alpha_k) = \dfrac{4\alpha_kx^*H_kx}{\alpha_k^2 + 2\alpha_kx^*H_kx + x^*P_k^*P_kx}$. As a result,

$$min_{\alpha_k>0}\{\|V(\alpha_k)\|_2\} = 1 - max_{\alpha_k>0}f(\alpha_k). \tag{4.8}$$

Since

$$f'(\alpha_k) = \frac{4x^*H_kx(x^*P_k^*P_kx - \alpha_k^2)}{(\alpha_k^2 + 2\alpha_kx^*H_kx + x^*P_k^*P_kx)^2}, \tag{4.9}$$

$f(\alpha_k)$ is gradually increasing if $\alpha_k \in (0, \sqrt{x^* P_k^* P_k x})$, $f(\alpha_k)$ is gradually decreasing if $\alpha_k \in (\sqrt{x^* P_k^* P_k x}, \infty)$ and consequently, when $\alpha_k = \sqrt{x^* P_k^* P_k x}$, $f(\alpha_k)$ gets its maximum $max_{\alpha_k>0} f(\alpha_k) = \dfrac{2x^* H_k x}{x^* H_k x + \sqrt{x^* P_k^* P_k x}}$. Therefore, when

$$\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star = arg\ min_{\alpha_k>0}\{\|V(\alpha_k)\|_2\} = \sqrt{x^* P_k^* P_k x} \in [\sigma_n^k, \sigma_1^k],$$

$$\|V(\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star)\|_2 = min_{\alpha_k>0}\{\|V(\alpha_k)\|_2\} = \sqrt{\frac{\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star - x^* H_k x}{\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star + x^* H_k x}},$$

which shows that we complete the proof. □

REMARK 4.6. *Usually, it holds that*

$$\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star \neq \alpha_{opt} = arg\ min_{\alpha_k>0}\{\rho(M(\alpha_k))\} \tag{4.10}$$

and

$$\rho(M(\widehat{\alpha}_k^\star)) \geq \rho(M(\alpha_{opt})). \tag{4.11}$$

5. Conclusions. In this paper we have studied the convergence of the parallel mulitisplitting iterative methods and the parallel PSS methods for the solution of non-Hermitian positive definite linear systems. Some of our results can be regarded as generalizations of analogous results for the Hermitian positive definite case.

Acknowledgments. The first author would like to acknowledge the hospitality of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science at Emory University, where this work was completed. Many thanks also to Professor Michele Benzi for suggesting the topic of this paper and for helpful suggestions.

REFERENCES

[1] Z.-Z. Bai, G. H. Golub, L.-Z. Lu, and J.-F. Yin, Block triangular and skew-Hermitian splitting methods for positive-definite linear systems, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 26:844–863, 2005.

[2] Z.-Z. Bai, G. H. Golub, and M. K. Ng, On successive-overrelaxation acceleration of the Hermitian and skew-Hermitian splitting iterations, *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 17:319–335, 2007.

[3] Z.-Z. Bai, On the comparisons of the multisplitting unsymmetric AOR methods for $M-$matrices, *Calcolo*, 32:207–220, 1995.

[4] M. Benzi and D. Bertaccini, Block preconditioning of real-valued iterative algorithms for complex linear systems, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 28:598–618, 2008.

[5] M. Benzi and M. K. Ng, Preconditioned iterative methods for weighted Toeplitz least squares problems, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 27:1106–1124, 2006.

[6] A. Berman and R. J. Plemmons, *Nonnegative Matrices in the Mathematical Sciences*, Academic Press, New York, NY, 1979. Reprinted by SIAM, Philadelphia, 1994.

[7] G. Cao and Y. Song, On multisplitting methods for symmetric positive semidefinite linear systems, *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, DOI: 10.1002/nla.619, 2008.

[8] Z.-H. Cao and Z. Y. Liu, Symmetric multisplitting of a symmetric positive definite matrix, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 285:309–319, 1998.

[9] D.-W. Chang, Covergence analysis of the parallel multisplitting TOR method, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 72:169–177, 1996.

[10] J.-J. Climent and C. Perea, Convergence and comparison theorems for multisplittings, *Numer. Math.*, 6:93–107, 1999.

[11] H. Elman, D. Silvester, and A. Wathen, *Finite Elements and Fast Iterative Solvers with Applications in Incompressible Fluid Dynamics*, Numerical Mathematics and Scientific Computation, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2005.

[12] L. Elsner, Comparisons of regular splittings and multisplitting methods, *Numer. Math.*, 56:283–289, 1989.

[13] L. Elsner, V.Mehrmann, Convergence of block iterative methods for linear systems arising in the numerical solution of Euler equations, *Numer. Math.*, 59:541-559, 1991.

[14] A. Frommer and G. Mayer, Convergence of relaxed parallel multisplitting methods, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 119:141–152, 1989.

[15] A. Frommer, On the theory and practice of multisplitting methods in parallel computation, *Computing*, 49:63–74, 1992.

[16] A. Hadjidimos and A. K. Yeyios, Some notes on multisplitting methods and m-step preconditioners for linear systems, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 248:277–301, 1996.

[17] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1985.

[18] T.-Z. Huang, S.-Q. Shen and H.-B. Li, On generalized $H-$matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 396:81-90, 2005.

[19] J. Li, The positive definiteness of complex matrix, *Mathematics in Practice and Theory,* 25(2):59-63, 1995.

[20] W. Li, W. Sun and K. Liu, Parallel multisplitting iterative methods for singular $M-$matrices, *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 8:181–190, 2001.

[21] R. Nabben, On a class of matrices which arise in the numerical solution of Euler equations, *Numer. Math.*, 63:411-431, 1992.

[22] R. Nabben, A note on comparison theorems for splitting and multisplittings of Hermitian positive definite matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 233:67–80, 1996.

[23] M. Neumann and R. J. Plemmons, Convergence of parallel multisplitting iterative methods for M-matrices, *linear Algebra Appl.*, 88-89:559–573, 1987.

[24] D. P. O'Leary and R. E. White, Multi-splittings of matrices and papallel solution of linear systems, *SIAM J. Alg. Disc. Meth.*, 6:630–640, 1985.

[25] J. M. Ortega and R. J. Plemmons, Extension of the Ostrowski-Reich theorem for SOR iterations, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 28:177–191, 1979.

[26] J. M. Ortega, *Numerical Analysis, A Second Course*, Academic Press, New York, NY, 1972. Reprinted by SIAM, Philadelphia, 1990.

[27] Y. Song, Comparison theorems for splittings of matrices, *Numer. Math.*, 92:563–591, 2002.

[28] Y. Song, On parallel multisplitting iterative methods for singular linear systems, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 162:585–604, 2005.

[29] Y. Song, Convergence of parallel multisplitting methods for $H-$matrices, *Internat. J. Comput. Math.*, 50:213–232, 1994.

[30] P. Stein, Some general theorems on iterants, *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards,* 48(1):82–83, 1952.

[31] C.-L. Wang, Nonstationary multisplittings with general weighting matrices for non-Hermitian positive definite systems, *Applied mathematics Letters*, 16:919–924, 2003.

[32] D. Wang, On the convergence of the parallel multisplitting AOR algorithm, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 154-156:473–486, 1991.

[33] X. Wang, Comparison theorems for a class of parallel multisplitting AOR Type iterative methods, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 269:1–16, 1998.

[34] R. E. White, Multisplittings and parallel iterative methods, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 64:567–577, 1987.

[35] R. E. White, Multisplittings with different weighting schemes, *SIAM J. Matrix. Anal. Appl.*, 10:481–493, 1989.

[36] J. Weissinger, Verallgemainerungen des Seidelschen Iterationsverfahrens, Z. Angew. Math. Mech., 33:155-162, 1953.

[37] R. E. White, Multisplittings of a symmetric positive definite matrix, *SIAM J. Matrix. Anal. Appl.*, 11:69–82, 1990.

[38] J.-Y. Yuan, The Ostrowski-Reich theorem for SOR iterations: extensions to the rank deficient case, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 315:189–196, 2000.

[39] J. H. Yun, Covergence of SSOR multisplitting method for an $H-$matrix, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 217:252–258, 2008.

[40] J. H. Yun and S. W. Kim, Parallel relaxed multisplitting methods for a symmetric positive definite matrix, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 176:150–165, 2006.

[41] J. H. Yun, E. H. Kim and S. Oh, Multisplitting preconditioners for a symmetric positive definite matrix, *J. Appl. Math. & Comput.*, 22:169–180, 2006.

[42] C.-y. Zhang and M. Benzi, P-regular Splitting Iterative Methods for Non-Hermitian Linear Systems, *Technical Reports No. TR-2009-014*, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Emory University, 2009.